The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)

Preface: The AI-Assisted Analytical Method

This collection of case studies represents a new methodology in historical research: the fusion of human theoretical direction with artificial intelligence's synthetic capacity.

These studies were produced through a collaborative process between **Thomas J. Bryan** (human researcher/author) and **Gemini** (Google's AI model). This partnership was not merely one of dictation and transcription, but of rigorous structural execution.

The Division of Labor:

- **Human Contribution:** The establishment of the "Asset vs. Benefit" theoretical framework, the definition of the prosecutorial narrative voice (Style B), the selection of historical targets, and the final analytical judgment.
- **AI Contribution:** The rapid synthesis of vast historical datasets, the rigorous application of the 8-part structural template, the identification of specific quantitative evidence (wealth statistics, casualty figures, legislative texts), and the drafting of the narrative text.

The Methodology:
Each study is built on the "Elite Capture Analysis Framework," a protocol designed to strip away the neutral tone of standard historiography. Instead of balancing competing narratives, these studies relentlessly track the movement of assets ("Stock") and the concession of temporary benefits ("Flow"). They function as forensic audits of political regimes, asking a single question: When the government changed, who kept the land?
This collaboration demonstrates that AI, when guided by a strong intellectual framework, can move beyond summarization to perform structural, critical analysis of power.

Thomas J. Bryan & Gemini
November 2025

The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)..... 1
Preface: The AI-Assisted Analytical Method.....1
The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)..... 4
Part 1 of 4: The Stake in Society - Founding a Republic for the Few..... 4
Introduction: The Paradox of 1776.....4
I. THE FOUNDATION: The "Stake in Society" Doctrine..... 4
II. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS: The Architecture of Exclusion..... 5
III. WEALTH EXTRACTION: The Policies of the Few.....5
The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)..... 7
Part 2 of 4: The Resistance - Shays, Whiskey, and the Fear of the Mob (1780-1800).....7
Introduction: The Rebellion of the Dispossessed.....7
IV. SHAYS' REBELLION (1786): The Crisis of Debt.....7
V. THE CONSTITUTION AS A PROPERTY SHIELD (1787)..... 8
VI. THE WHISKEY REBELLION (1794): Enforcing the Extraction.....8
The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)..... 10
Part 3 of 4: The Jeffersonian Compromise - Democratizing the Style, Preserving the Substance (1800-1820)..... 10
Introduction: The "Revolution of 1800" as Elite Rotation..... 10
VII. THE AGRARIAN OLIGARCHY: Land as the Only Legitimacy..... 10
VIII. THE RISE OF UNIVERSAL WHITE MALE SUFFRAGE: The Elite Retreat.....11
IX. THE HIDDEN BARRIER: From Property to Race..... 11
The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)..... 13
Part 4 of 4: The Synthesis - How the Elite Survived the "Rise of the Common Man" (1820-1828)..... 13
Introduction: The Jacksonian "Revolution" as Elite Adaptation..... 13
X. THE NEW MECHANISMS OF CONTROL: Managing the "Flow" of Votes..... 13
XI. FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS: The Republic of Owners in Retrospect.....14
XII. CONCLUSION: The Hidden Oligarchy.....14
Thematic Bibliography: The Republic of Owners (1776-1828)..... 15
I. GENERAL HISTORIES OF THE EARLY REPUBLIC & CLASS..... 15
II. PROPERTY QUALIFICATIONS AND SUFFRAGE..... 15
III. ELITE MECHANISMS: DEBT, SPECULATION, AND LAW..... 15
IV. REBELLION AND SUPPRESSION..... 16
V. THE JACKSONIAN TRANSITION & PARTY MACHINES..... 16
VI. PRIMARY SOURCE COLLECTIONS & DOCUMENTS..... 16

The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)

Part 1 of 4: The Stake in Society - Founding a Republic for the Few

Introduction: The Paradox of 1776

The American Revolution is enshrined in the national mythology as the birth of democracy. "We the People" suggests a universal collective seizing sovereignty from a tyrant. But the legal reality of 1776 was starkly different. The "People" who seized power were not the 3 million inhabitants of the colonies; they were the 6% of the population who owned land.

From its inception, the American Republic was designed not as a democracy, but as a fortress for property. The Founders, men of immense wealth in land and slaves, feared nothing more than the "mob." They built a political system explicitly engineered to ensure that those without "Stock" (property) could never vote to redistribute the wealth of those who held it.

I. THE FOUNDATION: The "Stake in Society" Doctrine

The intellectual architecture of exclusion was not accidental; it was foundational. It relied on a single, powerful idea: only those with a material "stake" in the society (property) could be trusted to govern it.

A. John Adams and the Fear of the Propertyless

In 1776, John Adams wrote a private letter to James Sullivan that laid bare the elite consensus. He warned that if the property qualification were removed:

> *"New claims will arise; women will demand a vote; lads from twelve to twenty-one will think their rights not enough attended to; and every man who has not a farthing, will demand an equal voice with any other, in all acts of state. It tends to confound and destroy all distinctions, and prostrate all ranks to one common level."*

For Adams, the purpose of government was the defense of property. If the propertyless could vote, they would inevitably use that power to vote away the property of the rich. The "Flow" of democracy had to be dammed to protect the "Stock" of the elite.

B. Madison's Factionalism (Federalist No. 10)

James Madison, the architect of the Constitution, was equally explicit. In *Federalist No. 10*, he identified the "various and unequal distribution of property" as the primary source of political conflict.

- **The Fear:** He worried that a "majority faction" (the poor) would gain control and implement "wicked projects" like "a rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property."
- **The Solution:** A large republic with a filtered representative system would dilute the power of the poor, ensuring that the "enlightened views" of the elite prevailed.

II. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS: The Architecture of Exclusion

The state constitutions written between 1776 and 1780 translated this theory into hard law. They created a "Republic of Owners."

A. The Property Thresholds

- **New York (1777):** To vote for the State Assembly, a man had to own freehold property worth £20 or pay rent. But to vote for the State *Senate* or Governor (the real seats of power), he had to own a freehold worth £100. This effectively created two classes of citizenship: a lower tier for small farmers and an upper tier for the manorial elite.
- **Virginia (1776):** The home of Jefferson maintained strictly freehold suffrage. Only those owning 25 acres of improved land or 50 acres of unimproved land could vote. In a state dominated by vast plantations, this excluded tenant farmers, laborers, and the entire landless white population.
- **Massachusetts (1780):** The constitution required a freehold estate yielding £3 annual income or an estate worth £60. This was a deliberate move to disenfranchise the urban artisans of Boston who had been the foot soldiers of the Revolution.

B. The "Freeholder" Concept

The legal category of "Freeholder" was the key to the oligarchy. It meant you owned land "in fee simple"—permanent, heritable ownership.

- **The Exclusion:** This excluded renters, tenant farmers, apprentices, journeymen, laborers, and anyone dependent on wages.
- **The Logic:** A man who worked for wages was considered "dependent" on his master and therefore incapable of independent political will. Only the owner of "Stock" (land) was free; the owner of "Flow" (labor) was a servant.

III. WEALTH EXTRACTION: The Policies of the Few

With the electorate restricted to property owners (roughly 60% of white males in some areas, but as low as 20% in others, and essentially 0% of the total population when women and enslaved people are counted), the new state governments passed laws that aggressively favored asset holders.

A. The Speculator's Paradise

The most egregious example was the handling of Revolutionary War debt and land.

- **Hamilton's Funding Plan:** The federal government paid off war bonds at face value ("par"). These bonds had been bought by speculators from desperate veterans for pennies on the dollar. The policy transferred massive wealth from the tax-paying public to a tiny clique of financiers.
- **The Yazoo Land Fraud (1795):** In Georgia, the legislature (elected by property owners) sold 35 million acres of western land to four private companies for $500,000—a fraction of its value. The legislators had been bribed with shares in the companies. It was the perfect fusion of political power and land speculation.

B. The Whiskey Tax (1791)

To pay for the bond redemption (which benefited the rich), the government levied an excise tax on whiskey.

- **The Target:** This tax hit small western farmers who distilled their grain into whiskey for transport.
- **The Beneficiary:** It spared the large eastern merchants. When farmers rebelled (The Whiskey Rebellion), Washington led an army to crush them, proving that the new Republic would enforce the extraction of wealth from the poor to pay the rich.

Part 1 Conclusion:
By 1800, the United States was a "Democracy" in name only. It was, legally and structurally, an oligarchy of land and capital. The "Flow" of liberty had been rhetorically granted to all, but the "Stock" of political power was strictly reserved for those who already owned the country. But the pressure was building. As the frontier expanded and the landless population grew, the "Stake in Society" doctrine would face its first existential threat: the rise of the common man.
End of Part 1

The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)

Part 2 of 4: The Resistance - Shays, Whiskey, and the Fear of the Mob (1780-1800)

Introduction: The Rebellion of the Dispossessed

The decade following the Revolution was not a period of harmony; it was a period of class warfare. The farmers who had fought for independence returned home to find themselves disenfranchised by the very state constitutions they had bled for.

They faced a crushing economic reality: they had no "Flow" (cash) to pay taxes, but the state demanded hard currency to pay off the "Stock" (war bonds) held by the elite. When they could not pay, the state seized their land. This triggered a series of rebellions that terrified the Founding Fathers and led directly to the drafting of the US Constitution—a document designed to put the "mob" back in its place.

IV. SHAYS' REBELLION (1786): The Crisis of Debt

In western Massachusetts, farmers were losing their land at an alarming rate. The state legislature, dominated by eastern merchants, had raised taxes to pay off war debts at face value.

A. The Economics of the Uprising

- ***The Squeeze:*** *Farmers had no hard currency. They operated on barter. The state demanded taxes in gold or silver.*
- ***The Seizure:*** *When farmers couldn't pay, the courts seized their farms (Stock) and sold them at auction to wealthy speculators.*
- ***The Reaction:*** *Daniel Shays, a Revolutionary War veteran, led an army of farmers to shut down the courts. Their demand was simple: stop the foreclosures.*

B. The Elite Panic

The rebellion terrified the elite. Henry Knox wrote to George Washington: "They see the weakness of government; they feel at once their own poverty, compared with the opulent, and their own force, and they are determined to make use of the latter, in order to remedy the former."

- ***The Lesson:*** *The elite realized that the Articles of Confederation were too weak to*

protect property. They needed a stronger central government to crush internal dissent.

V. THE CONSTITUTION AS A PROPERTY SHIELD (1787)

The Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia was, in essence, a meeting of creditors. Fifty-five men, mostly lawyers, merchants, and planters, gathered to create a government that could secure assets.

A. The Anti-Democratic Safeguards

They built a system of "filters" to insulate the government from the popular will:

- ***The Senate:*** *Senators were chosen by state legislatures, not the people. They were intended to represent the "landed interest."*
- ***The President:*** *Elected by an Electoral College, not the popular vote.*
- ***The Supreme Court:*** *Appointed for life, completely removed from democratic accountability.*
- ***The Contract Clause:*** *Article I, Section 10 prohibited states from passing any law "impairing the Obligation of Contracts." This was a direct ban on debt relief laws. It constitutionally forbade the poor from voting to cancel their debts to the rich.*

B. Madison's Design

Madison was explicit. He wanted a government that would "protect the minority of the opulent against the majority." The structure of the federal government was the ultimate "Stock" protection mechanism.

VI. THE WHISKEY REBELLION (1794): Enforcing the Extraction

The new federal government's first major test was enforcing the extraction of wealth from the poor to the rich.

A. Hamilton's Machine

Alexander Hamilton, the first Treasury Secretary, built a financial system designed to empower the elite.

- ***Assumption:*** *The federal government assumed state debts.*
- ***Funding:*** *It paid bondholders at face value.*
- ***Taxation:*** *To pay for this, it taxed whiskey—the main currency of the western frontier.*

B. The Military Response

When Pennsylvania farmers refused to pay the tax, Washington didn't negotiate. He raised an army of 13,000 men—larger than the army he commanded during the Revolution—and marched west.

- ***The Message:*** *The message was clear: The Republic would use overwhelming military force to collect taxes from the poor to pay interest to the rich. The "Flow" of tax*

revenue was sacrosanct because it supported the "Stock" of federal credit.

Part 2 Conclusion:

By 1800, the "Republic of Owners" had successfully defended itself against the first wave of popular resistance. Shays had been crushed. The Whiskey Rebels had been dispersed. The Constitution had established a fortress for property rights. But the demographic tide was turning. The population was doubling every 20 years, and the new states in the West were beginning to question the property qualifications that kept the oligarchy in power. The stage was set for the rise of Jacksonian "Democracy"—and the elite's adaptation to it.

End of Part 2

The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)

Part 3 of 4: The Jeffersonian Compromise - Democratizing the Style, Preserving the Substance (1800-1820)

Introduction: The "Revolution of 1800" as Elite Rotation

The election of Thomas Jefferson is often heralded as the triumph of the common man over the aristocratic Federalists. In style, it was. Jefferson wore plain clothes, walked to his inauguration, and spoke of the "yeoman farmer."

But in substance, the "Revolution of 1800" was a rotation of elites. It replaced the rule of Northern merchants (Stock in capital) with the rule of Southern planters (Stock in land/slaves). The property qualifications for voting remained largely intact in the older states. The "Flow" of rhetoric changed, but the "Stock" of power remained concentrated.

VII. THE AGRARIAN OLIGARCHY: Land as the Only Legitimacy

Jeffersonian democracy was not based on the rights of labor; it was based on the rights of land. Jefferson believed that cities, factories, and wage labor were corrupt.

A. The "Depravity" of the Propertyless

In Notes on the State of Virginia, Jefferson famously wrote: "Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition."

- ***The implication:*** *A man without land (a wage earner) was not a free agent. He was a tool. Therefore, he should not vote.*
- ***The Policy:*** *This justified the continued disenfranchisement of the growing urban working class. The Jeffersonian ideal was a republic of small landowners, but the reality was a republic dominated by large slaveholders who claimed to speak for them.*

B. The Louisiana Purchase (1803) as Asset Expansion

Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory was the ultimate "Stock" expansion.

- ***The Goal:*** *It provided land to ensure the agrarian elite could expand indefinitely.*
- ***The Effect:*** *It defused class conflict in the East by allowing the landless to leave (safety valve theory). Instead of redistributing wealth in Virginia, the elite opened up*

new wealth in the West—wealth taken from Indigenous nations.

VIII. THE RISE OF UNIVERSAL WHITE MALE SUFFRAGE: The Elite Retreat

By 1810, the property qualifications were becoming untenable. The new states entering the Union (Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio) had fewer restrictions to attract settlers. This put pressure on the old states to reform or face depopulation.

A. The Maryland Reform (1802-1810)

Maryland, a state dominated by a planter aristocracy, became the first to abolish property qualifications for white men.

- ***The Elite Calculation:*** *The elite realized that poor white men were not their enemies; they were their allies against the Black population. By giving the vote to the poor white man, the planter secured his loyalty to the racial hierarchy (Stock of whiteness).*
- ***The Trade-off:*** *Voting rights (Flow) were granted to poor whites, but the Senate and Governorship remained effectively controlled by the wealthy through gerrymandering and social deference.*

B. The War of 1812: The Blood Tax

The War of 1812 exposed the hypocrisy of the property qualification. Poor men were drafted to fight the British.

- ***The Argument:*** *Veterans argued, "If I am good enough to fight, I am good enough to vote."*
- ***The Result:*** *In the decade following the war, Connecticut (1818), Massachusetts (1821), and New York (1821) stripped away property qualifications for white men.*

IX. THE HIDDEN BARRIER: From Property to Race

As property qualifications fell for white men, they were often added for Black men. This was the "Herrenvolk" compromise.

A. New York (1821): The Racial Swap

In 1821, the New York constitutional convention abolished the property qualification for white men.

- ***The Twist:*** *In the same document, they raised the property qualification for Black men to $250 (a prohibitive sum).*
- ***The Mechanism:*** *Democracy was expanded for the racial majority by explicitly restricting it for the racial minority. The "Stock" of white supremacy was consolidated to manage the "Flow" of democratic expansion.*

Part 3 Conclusion:

By 1820, the "Republic of Owners" was transforming into a "White Man's Democracy." The

elite had learned a crucial lesson: they could afford to let poor white men vote, as long as those men identified their interests with their race rather than their class. The property qualification was dying, but the oligarchy was evolving. It was preparing to ride the tiger of the Jacksonian era.

End of Part 3

The Republic of Owners: Property Qualifications and the Hidden Oligarchy in the Early United States (1776-1828)

Part 4 of 4: The Synthesis - How the Elite Survived the "Rise of the Common Man" (1820-1828)

Introduction: The Jacksonian "Revolution" as Elite Adaptation

The election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 is the traditional endpoint of the "Era of Good Feelings" and the beginning of "Jacksonian Democracy." The narrative is simple: the property qualification fell, and the common man took power.

But a structural analysis reveals a different reality. The property qualification fell for white men, but the elite did not fall. Instead, they adapted. They built new mechanisms—political parties, patronage machines, and racial solidarity—to control the expanded electorate. The "Republic of Owners" did not end; it simply widened its base to include the propertyless white male, while simultaneously hardening the exclusion of everyone else.

X. THE NEW MECHANISMS OF CONTROL: Managing the "Flow" of Votes

Once the "Stock" of property was no longer the sole barrier to political entry, the elite had to find new ways to manage the "Flow" of democracy.

A. The Party Machine as Gatekeeper

Martin Van Buren, a New York lawyer and elite operator, invented the modern political party (the Albany Regency).

- ***The Function:*** *The party machine replaced the property qualification. To get elected, a candidate needed the party's endorsement. To get the endorsement, they had to serve the party's donors (elites).*
- ***The Patronage:*** *The "Spoils System" turned government jobs into currency. This bought the loyalty of the new working-class voters. They voted not for their class interests, but for the promise of a job from the elite-controlled machine.*

B. The Bank War (1832) as Fake Populism

Jackson's war against the Second Bank of the United States is often cited as a victory for the people against the money power.

- ***The Reality:*** *It was a war between two factions of capital: the established Philadelphia/Northeast financial elite (Nicholas Biddle) versus the rising state-bank and agrarian elites of the South and West.*

- ***The Outcome:*** *Jackson destroyed the central bank, but he did not democratize finance. He simply transferred federal deposits to "Pet Banks"—state banks controlled by his political allies. The "Stock" of financial power shifted from one group of wealthy men to another, under the guise of liberating the "Flow" of credit for the common man.*

XI. FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS: The Republic of Owners in Retrospect

Looking back at the period 1776-1828 through the core framework, the pattern is clear.

A. Flow vs. Stock

- ***Flow (Conceded):*** *Over 50 years, the right to vote (Flow) was gradually conceded to non-property owners. The legal definition of "The People" expanded.*
- ***Stock (Preserved):*** *The ownership of the country (Stock) remained heavily concentrated. The Constitution, the courts, and the Senate ensured that this expanded electorate could not easily redistribute property. The "contract clause" and the sanctity of debt prevented the "wicked projects" Madison feared.*

B. The Racial Safety Valve

The expansion of white democracy was directly funded by the contraction of Black and Indigenous freedom.

- ***Indigenous Land:*** *The "common man" could only become an owner because the state aggressively seized Indigenous land (Stock) to distribute to white settlers.*
- ***Slavery:*** *The Southern elite maintained their power by uniting with poor whites on the basis of race. The "Flow" of democratic rights to poor whites was the bribe paid to preserve the "Stock" of slavery.*

XII. CONCLUSION: The Hidden Oligarchy

The United States began as an explicit oligarchy of landholders. By 1828, it had become a democracy of white men. But the elite had learned a valuable lesson: they did not need to hoard the vote to hoard the wealth. They could control a mass electorate through parties, patronage, and racial division just as effectively as they had controlled a restricted electorate through property laws.

The "Republic of Owners" had successfully transformed into the "Republic of Parties," but the owners were still in charge.

End of Case Study

Thematic Bibliography: The Republic of Owners (1776-1828)

I. GENERAL HISTORIES OF THE EARLY REPUBLIC & CLASS

- **Beard, Charles A.** *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913).
  - *Key Contribution:* The foundational text arguing that the Constitution was an economic document designed by creditors to protect property against the majority.
- **Wilentz, Sean.** *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850* (1984).
  - *Key Contribution:* Tracks the emergence of class consciousness and the conflict between artisan republicanism and merchant capitalism.
- **Wood, Gordon S.** *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (1992).
  - *Key Contribution:* While often celebratory, provides essential data on the hierarchical nature of colonial society and the "patronage" systems that elites used to maintain control.

II. PROPERTY QUALIFICATIONS AND SUFFRAGE

- **Keyssar, Alexander.** *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States* (2000).
  - *Key Contribution:* The definitive history of disenfranchisement, detailing specific property requirements by state and the long struggle to remove them.
- **Williamson, Chilton.** *American Suffrage: From Property to Democracy, 1760-1860* (1960).
  - *Key Contribution:* Detailed state-by-state analysis of the transition from freehold suffrage to universal white male suffrage.
- **Ratcliffe, Donald J.** *Party Spirit in a Frontier Republic: Democratic Politics in Ohio, 1793-1821* (1998).
  - *Key Contribution:* Analyzes how western expansion challenged eastern property qualifications.

III. ELITE MECHANISMS: DEBT, SPECULATION, AND LAW

- **Holton, Woody.** *Unruly Americans and the Origins of the Constitution* (2007).
  - *Key Contribution:* Documents how the Constitution was a direct response to "excessive democracy" (debt relief laws) in the states.
- **Bouton, Terry.** *Taming Democracy: "The People," the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (2007).
  - *Key Contribution:* Focuses on Pennsylvania, showing how the elite shut down the radical democratic potential of the Revolution to protect financial interests.
- **Magrath, C. Peter.** *Yazoo: Law and Politics in the New Republic* (1966).

    - *Key Contribution:* Definitive account of the Yazoo land fraud and the Supreme Court's protection of property rights in *Fletcher v. Peck*.

IV. REBELLION AND SUPPRESSION

- **Richards, Leonard L.** *Shays's Rebellion: The American Revolution's Final Battle* (2002).
    - *Key Contribution:* Reframes Shays' Rebellion not as a mob action but as a principled defense of community property against state extraction.
- **Slaughter, Thomas P.** *The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution* (1986).
    - *Key Contribution:* Analyzes the rebellion as a conflict between center and periphery, and wealthy easterners vs. poor westerners.
- **Hogeland, William.** *The Whiskey Rebellion* (2006).
    - *Key Contribution:* Highlights Hamilton's role in provoking the conflict to demonstrate federal power and enforce the bond-funding scheme.

V. THE JACKSONIAN TRANSITION & PARTY MACHINES

- **Remini, Robert V.** *Martin Van Buren and the Making of the Democratic Party* (1959).
    - *Key Contribution:* Documents the creation of the party machine as a mechanism for managing mass suffrage.
- **Sellers, Charles.** *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (1991).
    - *Key Contribution:* Massive synthesis arguing that the "market revolution" was a capitalist transformation that commodified labor and land, opposed by a subsistence-oriented majority.

VI. PRIMARY SOURCE COLLECTIONS & DOCUMENTS

- **The Federalist Papers.** (Specifically No. 10, Madison on factions and property).
- **State Constitutions:** New York (1777), Massachusetts (1780), Virginia (1776). (Text of property qualifications).
- **Adams, John.** *Letter to James Sullivan* (May 26, 1776). (The "Stake in Society" argument).
- **Hamilton, Alexander.** *Report on Public Credit* (1790). (The plan for funding debt at par).

End of Bibliography

Copyright and Licensing

© 2025 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*